

DETROIT INTERMODAL FREIGHT TERMINAL PROJECT
Draft Notes
Local Advisory Council Meeting
August 13, 2003

Purpose: To review the progress of the DIFT and to particularly discuss the concepts for Alternative 2 – Improve/Expand Existing Terminals, and the economics of intermodal terminal development.

Attendance: See attached.

Discussion:

Meeting Conduct Procedures

Following introductions, Mohammed Alghurabi explained the meeting conduct procedures would allow questions and comments by LAC members to be covered first. Those in attendance who were not LAC members would have their items discussed during the “public comment” section of the meeting.

Review of Notes of July 8 Meeting

Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that the notes of the July 8 LAC meeting were available for review and asked for any comments. There were none.

Review of Notes of June 4 Scoping Meeting

Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that the notes of the June 4 scoping meeting had been compiled from various Project Team member notes as well as the transcript. He asked for any comments. There were none.

Update of Alternative 2 Concepts

Joe Corradino introduced the discussion of the Alternative 2 concepts by indicating that, consistent with the commitment made at the July LAC meeting, the proposal for expanding/improving the different terminals had been refined to better establish access requirements, gates and other characteristics. He then asked Randy Henke to review each of the configurations using various wall maps.

Randy Henke began with the Livernois-Junction Yard and explained how the gates were placed at Livernois Avenue for Norfolk Southern and at the intersection of Waterman/Dix/Vernor for CSX. Steve Tobocman questioned locating a gate at the latter intersection. Randy Henke indicated that the gate's placement was consistent with the current design plans of CSX to further improve/expand its terminal under a \$10 million program that has been approved by MDOT. Tom Drake emphasized that program was separate from the Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Project.

Steve Tobocman asked Tom Drake of CSX which routes the trucks would use in gaining access to the site. Tom Drake indicated that he was unable to explain the truck access patterns.

Father Joe Redican asked Tom Drake if there were an entrance there today. Tom Drake indicated that trucks are using that area now but they do not access the CSX intermodal terminal but a container storage facility. He noted that storage facility would be vacating the property that CSX owns.

Father Redican indicated that this is a "terrible" intersection at which to place the terminal entrance. Steve Tobocman noted the ongoing discussions about a major commercial development near that area.

Joe Corradino indicated that the plan for a gate at Dix/Waterman/Vernor is consistent with the CSX plans. Nevertheless, the analysis that will go forward will suggest whether that gate should remain and/or another gate added.

Father Joe Redican indicated that he did not recollect any discussion in the past about a gate to be proposed for that intersection. Joe Corradino explained that at one point a gate at the Waterman/Dix/Vernor intersection had been proposed for the consolidated terminal alternative. However, after review, that gate had been eliminated.

Randy Henke then proceeded with further discussions about how the gates at the Livernois-Junction Yard would work, indicating that two gates were necessary as it was not acceptable for CSX to come in the Livernois Avenue gate, and then cross the intermodal operation of Norfolk Southern to gain access to the CSX side of the property. Bill Schraeder asked where the

railroads would conduct the loading. Randy Henke, using the maps, pointed to where the trains would be loaded and containers stored.

Joe Corradino noted the proposal to place Central Avenue below the railroad platform and to close Lonyo Avenue. In that proposal, there would be the possibility of having 10 property acquisitions plus one partial property acquisition. The latter is of the Moroun property on the northwest corner of Central and John Kronk.

Steve Tobocman asked are there any businesses and residences in the area to be acquired. Joe Corradino indicated that the answer was yes and that a field survey would be done between now and the public meeting to validate what is on those properties.

Chris Gulock asked for a review of the locations of the gates for the expand/improve concept for the Livernois-Junction Yard. Randy Henke indicated that today NS and CSX currently use only the Livernois Avenue gate. In the future, their business practices dictate that a gate be provided for CSX which would serve only its intermodal traffic. That latter gate would be at the intersection of Dix/Waterman/Vernor. The gate at Livernois would remain but it would only serve NS traffic.

Chris Gulock asked Tom Drake if he knew where the container storage facility would be relocated. Tom Drake indicated he did not know.

Randy Henke then proceeded to discuss the CP/Expressway terminal layout under the improve/expand alternative. He noted that there were two options. One would have the access off of Bagley and include the property in the middle of the terminal expansion area now owned by the Moroun interests. The second terminal expansion concept excluded the Moroun property and, in turn, added five properties along the east side of 20th Street and provide access via 20th Street to the terminal.

Karen Kavanaugh asked if the hospital property were involved in both options for expanding the CP/Expressway terminal. Joe Corradino indicated that the answer was yes. Karen Kavanaugh indicated it was her understanding that the Detroit River Tunnel Partnership (DRTP) had a lease on the hospital property. Joe Corradino responded that he was unaware of such a lease.

Randy Henke then began the discussion of the CP/Oak terminal under the improve/expand alternative. He indicated that the gate would be on the west side of the terminal with improved access for each of two options to I-96 at Evergreen. With this access, the use of the service drive along the Southfield Freeway to enter the terminal would not be necessary. Joe Corradino indicated that there would be about 60 acres involved in this acquisition which involved 14 properties with potential full acquisition and one with partial acquisition. If the entire property that was considered to be a partial acquisition were to be included, then the size of the expansion could grow from 60 to 100 acres.

Bill Schrader indicated that he talked to people involved with the CP/Oak terminal and they had stated that they were not interested in the Farmer Jack property to the south of the Jeffries Freeway. Joe Corradino indicated that was consistent with the MDOT Project Team's discussion with CP.

Father Joe Redican asked how much of the expansion area is residential. Joe Corradino indicated that he believed that all the properties involved would be business-based. A field review was to be done to check that.

Randy Henke then discussed the CN/Moterm terminal expansion concepts under Alternative 2. The two options involved going to the east of the site and south of it. Going west was not considered viable because of the large number of residential properties that would be engaged. Going east of the site would probably involve about 50 acres of property for expansion; going south, into the Fairgrounds, would likely involve 40 acres for terminal expansion.

Joe Corradino noted that a detailed analysis had been started of the historical classification of this area of the Fairgrounds to determine whether there was a "fatal flaw" under federal law dealing with use of historic properties.

Bill Schrader noted that by going south and straddling 8 Mile Road, the project affects two counties. He asked which county was better to deal with. There was no response.

September Public Meetings

Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that the public meetings were tentatively set for September 15th to the 18th, inclusive, and pointed to the agenda packet for the locations. He asked Bob Parsons to speak to the process to be used in the public meetings. Bob indicated that the meetings would be different than the typical public forum in that a presentation and follow-up question-and-answer session would be included in the central part of the meeting. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that the next LAC meeting scheduled for September 10th would be a practice session of the September meetings.

Steve Tobocman, in reviewing the mailer for the meeting, urged that the definition of the alternatives be changed in the section “What is This All About?”. Father Redican suggested that a broader definition of the alternatives be used.

Karen Kavanaugh asked why the meeting for Southwest Detroit was going to be held in Dearborn. Joe Corradino indicated that the meeting was set for the Dearborn Police Department training room, as Dearborn police representatives had volunteered their facility. Because of the interest of involving Dearborn in the study, it was felt to be an appropriate place. Karen Kavanaugh indicated that she had a problem with a meeting being held at the police department. Chris Brayman of the police department indicated his confusion at the comment.

Joanna Ladki commented that she is concerned by holding a meeting at the Dearborn Police Department, MDOT is creating a situation that could prevent full participation in the DIFT process.

Bill Schrader asked if the September meetings were the last to be conducted on the DIFT. He was particularly interested when there would be the opportunity to review mitigation actions, such as sound walls. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that those developments will come as the project moves further along. He noted that this was not the last set of public meetings for the DIFT.

Steve Tobocman requested a clarification of the content of the public meetings. Joe Corradino indicated that the meetings would allow the expand/improve alternative to be brought to a level of definition in terms of access, size, potential property acquisition, to which the consolidated

terminal alternative had been developed. Subsequent studies would then define the details of the truck traffic and associated environmental effects.

Karen Kavanaugh indicated that, as it relates to traffic, a meeting that she had earlier in the day on the Bi-National Border Crossing Study involved the use of graphics that were very clear and she suggested that similar graphics be used in the DIFT study.

Joanna Ladki spoke again to make sure that MDOT was aware that she wanted all citizens to have the opportunity to express their concerns. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that they would take all comments under advisement.

Potential Economic Impact of Intermodal

Joe Corradino began a presentation on the potential economic impact of intermodal terminals by indicating that this presentation arose out of a discussion with Representative Tobocman about a concept that Joe Corradino had labeled “renaissance zone” for a project in another state. In that project, its wealth is to be captured and returned, in part, to the area that hosts the facility (in this case an airport). He pointed to materials in the handouts that provide details on the “renaissance zone” concept. He noted that the discussion tonight was about “other places,” not the DIFT. The economic analysis for the DIFT had not been conducted and, therefore, would not be available for several months.

Following the presentation of the renaissance zone concept, Representative Steve Tobocman asked if the wealth redistribution/reinvestment could be directed to community-related facilities. Joe Corradino indicated that, in the instance dealing with the Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Project, the slate is blank and, as long as an argument can be made that the improvements resulting from the reinvestment have a direct relationship to the impact of the intermodal activity, then he believed that such an investment could be made. That investment could be assured by writing it into the law that would likely be required to capture the DIFT investment.

Bill Schrader observed that the economic impact that comes from intermodal investment is from the spin-off which creates other jobs such as those in manufacturing.

Issues Paper

Joe Corradino presented a paper dealing with several issues that had been a matter of different interpretations over the last several months. These included:

- ?? the number of trucks associated with the consolidated terminal,
- ?? the size of the Livernois-Junction railroad terminal area,
- ?? categories of population included under environmental justice,
- ?? air quality and asthma-related effects,
- ?? the age of trucks in the future, and
- ?? the auto companies' position on intermodal.

Joe Corradino reviewed the calculation of truck trips for the consolidated terminal alternative for: 1) the Feasibility Study; and, 2) the EIS. He noted that the number of daily truck trips (two-way) was 16,000 in the Feasibility Study but is likely to range between 5,000 and 8,000 in the EIS. that change is due to a lower forecast of intermodal activity (lifts) and a lower ratio of truck-trips-per-lift.

Joe Corradino then used graphics to describe how the terminal area is currently configured and its size – about 500 acres. He noted the Feasibility Study started with a definition of a consolidated terminal that was almost 1,200 acres. He indicated that area had been reduced by the end of the Feasibility Study to 800 to 850 acres. Joe Corradino noted that the current configurations of the consolidated terminal at the Livernois-Junction Yard total 875 to 900 acres.

Karen Kavanaugh asked a number of questions about the size of the Livernois-Junction Yard and the areas that were or could be used for intermodal.

Joe Corradino noted that a meeting had been held to deal with the indication that Arabs should be covered in the environmental justice analysis of the DIFT. He indicated that, after review by the Federal Highway Administration and consultation with the Environmental Protection Agency, the Arab population is not considered a category under environmental justice. Father Redican indicated that the study must use the appropriate federal guidelines.

Joanna Ladki stressed that there were about 300,000 Arab persons in Michigan.

Joe Corradino noted the data gathered from the Michigan Department of Community Health in terms of asthma-related hospitalizations for children from the ages of 0 to 14. He noted that, if the information that was being presented was inaccurate, the MDOT Project Team would correct it as other data were made available.

Elizabeth Quinones indicated that she was an asthma sufferer and when she goes to the hospital, she is sent home with a breathing machine to prevent further hospitalization. Therefore she noted, the hospitalization data do not properly reflect the actual asthma problem. It was further indicated by a speaker in the audience that those who lack insurance are not covered in the hospitalization data. Joe Corradino asked whether the lack of health insurance would affect all segments of the population throughout the City of Detroit.

Bill Schrader asked if there were no expansion to any of the terminals, would the rail yards be paved. Tom Drake indicated that CSX will not be paving the Livernois-Junction Yard.

Ninfa Cancel mentioned the diesel emissions as a problem with asthma in southwest Detroit. Bruce King commented on the impacts of small particulate matter known as PM_{2.5}. Joe Corradino indicated that, generally speaking, diesel emissions represent a larger portion of PM_{2.5}. However, he noted that terminal dust is likely to have a greater effect on the local population in Southwest Detroit than terminal-related diesel activity because of the large, unpaved terminal area at the Livernois-Junction Yard. The terminal produces quantities of dust that are not very buoyant and therefore do not travel far before settling in high concentrations on the community surrounding the terminal area. On the other hand, activity at the yard that is being produced by diesel vehicles are gaseous and hot, become buoyant and drift away from the terminal area.

Steve Tobocman noted that the U of M School of Public Health is analyzing this information and it does not appear what Joe Corradino said is what he has heard. Joe Corradino indicated that a discussion of differences is invited to ensure the correct information is being used.

Ninfa Cancel asked if the position Joe Corradino has articulated about the effects of dust versus diesel vehicle emissions in southwest Detroit around the Livernois-Junction Yard were documented. Joe Corradino indicated that those comments were included in an exchange of

correspondence with MDEQ. Ninfa Cancel asked if she could obtain a copy. Joe Corradino indicated that the information would be made available later in the analysis process.

On the discussion of trucks of the future, Steve Tobocman asked if the analysis would be similar for all alternatives being considered. Joe Corradino responded that the analysis would be similar.

Joe Corradino indicated that the issues paper contained recognition that Paul Nye of Ford Motor Company had recently stated in the media, Ford's position of discouraging development at the Livernois-Junction Yard. Joe Corradino highlighted other written positions between 1995 and the year 2000 wherein Ford Motor Company supported consolidation of intermodal activity at the Livernois-Junction Yard. He further noted national publications of the train/intermodal industry indicating Ford's existing and expected continued use of intermodal activity. Finally, he highlighted the positions on the DIFT of General Motors and DaimlerChrysler as known to the MDOT Project Team.

Livernois Enhancement

Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that a field review had been conducted of the Livernois Enhancement Project and that the drawings and cost estimate had been refined. The matter was now going forward through various review processes with the City.

Public Comment

Mitchell Alexander asked if the dates for the next round of public meetings had been set. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated they had. Mitchell Alexander indicated that the outreach effort for the last meeting was not very good. He noted that he and the residents of southwest Detroit did not get a notice of the meeting. Mohammed Alghurabi said efforts are continuing to improve communications and requested Mitchell Alexander and organizations that he works with to assist in getting the word out of the upcoming public meetings. Mitchell Alexander stressed that the responsibility to get the word out was MDOT's. He also noted that the City Planning Commission had a meeting in 2001 at which 800 people showed up. Mohammed indicated that the mailing list that the City Planning Commission used then is the same one, plus more, that MDOT uses.

Martha Gruelle indicated that she thought she heard that there were two options for accommodating the consolidated terminal alternative. Joe Corradino indicated that there were and that the footprint for each of the two alternatives is included in the issues paper. One is smaller than another based upon how the railroads are positioned, i.e., north and south of John Kronk.

Martha Gruelle indicated that comments made today about air quality and dust do not correspond to things that she had heard before. Nevertheless, she would not delay the meeting but return at a later point with further information.

Josephine Powell stated that the comment about the age of the trucks in 2025 was different in writing than what Joe Corradino had said during the presentation. She asked what would be done in the air quality analysis between the present year and 2025. Joe Corradino indicated that an air quality conformity analysis would be conducted for not only the horizon year, 2025, but the expected year of opening which, generally speaking, is 2015.

There was some further discussion at that point of fugitive dust and its impact on air quality.

Next Meeting

It was noted that the next LAC meeting would be September 10th at 7:00 p.m. The location would be decided shortly.

DETROIT INTERMODAL FREIGHT TERMINAL PROJECT
Local Advisory Council Meeting
August 13, 2003

Attendance

LAC Members

Name	Representing	Phone
Mohammed Alghurabi	MDOT	517-373-7674
Todd Burko	Oakland County	
Don Cameron	FHWA	517-702-1826
Ninfa Cancel	Detroit Hispanic Development Corporation	313-967-4880
Mechelle deSouza	Senator Buzz Thomas' Office	
Tom Drake	CSX	734-464-4948
Abraham Elsheick	Truck Stop Owner	313-584-4200
Chris Gulock	Detroit Planning Commission	
Karen Kavanaugh	CBRA/SDBA	313-842-0986 x 26
Bruce King	City of Detroit Environmental Affairs	313-471-5103
Ken Kucel	Wayne County Engineering	313-224-8142
Col. Lundy	Michigan Department of Military Affairs	
Father Joe Redican	Holy Redeemer Schools	313-841-4433 x 207
William E. Schrader	Jeffries-Southfield	313-838-8387
Steve Tobocman	State Representative	517-373-0823
Chuck Tucker	City of Ferndale	248-546-2514
Fred Very	Wayne County Homeland Security	

LAC Observers

Name	Representing	Phone
Mitchell Alexander	SW Detroit Resident	
Mickey Blashfield	CENTRA	
Guy Corradino	The Corradino Group	305-594-0732
Joe Corradino	The Corradino Group	313-964-1926
Jeff Edwards	MDOT Metro Region	248-483-5114
Lisa Goldstein	SW Detroit	
Linda Gonzales	Detroit Hispanic Development	
Martha Gruelle	SDEV	
Randy Henke	Benesch	262-652-6677
Joanna Ladki	ACCESS/CBRA	313-216-2225
Bob Parsons	MDOT Public Involvement	517-373-9534
Brenda Peek	MDOT Metro Region	248-483-5109
Sherry Piacenti	MDOT	517-373-4152
Josephine Powell	Wayne County Env. Affairs	
Elizabeth Quinones	Detroit Seniors Dept.	
Harvey Santana	The Corradino Group	313-964-1926
Olga Savic	Legislative Assistant to Rep. Tobocmann	
Phil Walsh	Benesch	
Andy Zeigler	MDOT Metro Region	248-483-5108

L:\Projects\2846-A\WP\notes\LocalAdvisory\LocalAdv.Aug13.doc